



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/559,499	04/27/2000	Lauri Piikivi	872.0017USU	2125

29683 7590 07/03/2002

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
1809 BLACK ROCK TURNPIKE
FAIRFIELD, CT 06432

EXAMINER

KERR, DEBRA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/559,499

Applicant(s)

PIIKIVI ET AL.

Examiner

Debra E Kerr

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Wang (US 6,175,922).

Wang discloses an electronic transaction system that teaches all the limitations of the claimed invention. For example, Wang discloses a method for approving transactions that involves sending a transaction authorization requests over a bi-directional link between a vendor server and a portable electronic authorization device such as a cellular phone. A user with an Internet-enabled mobile device such as a cellular phone can contact a merchant's Internet server through a wireless gateway implemented using a short range wireless communication capability such as Bluetooth, and the merchant server can transmit encrypted messages to the user's cellular phone in response. The user's mobile station can have pre-installed software for performing electronic transaction verification, or the merchant server can download a transaction

Art Unit: 3625

program to the mobile station to enable the electronic transaction. The user can generate and send to the remote server user identification and authentication data, such as the user's digital signature, and authorization of the transaction. In response, the merchant site can download authorization confirmation and any electronic tokens required for accessing the service, such as an electronic ticket, to the user's mobile device for future service authorization (see at least Fig. 3A, Fig. 5B, Fig. 7A, Fig. 9A, col. 14 line 63 – col. 15 line 47, col. 16, lines 7 – col. 17 line 19, col. 18, line 33 – col. 19 line 52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 8, 9, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Ladd et al. (US 6,269,336).

Wang substantially discloses the invention, including entering PIN numbers via a keypad by a user of an ATM for authentication by comparing the PIN with a PIN stored at a remote computer. Wang fails to teach a user entering a PIN into a mobile station. Ladd teaches a mobile station such as a mobile phone, PDA or pager, that prompts a user to enter a unique PIN for user identification. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Wang's electronic

Art Unit: 3625

transaction system with the teaching of Ladd regarding prompting a user to enter a PIN at a mobile station. Doing so would provide a simple means to identify a user and prevent unauthorized use of a mobile station, thus increasing user security.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wang (US 5,917,913) discloses portable electronic authorization devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra E Kerr whose telephone number is (703) 305-3184. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins, can be reached on (703) 305-1440.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington D.C. 20231***

or faxed to:

(703)305-7687 [Official communications; including
After Final communications labeled
"Box AF"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.

Application/Control Number: 09/559,499


Page 5

Art Unit: 3625

Debra E. Kerr

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'DEK', written in a cursive style.

July 1, 2002

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Jeffrey A. Smith', written in a cursive style.
JEFFREY A. SMITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER